DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 533 SP 009 811

AUTHOR Cyphert, Frederick
TITLE Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving? Occasional Paper No. 11.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE May 75
NOTE 10p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Budgets; Collective Bargaining; *Educational Finance; *Educational Planning; Enrollment Rate; *Enrollment Trends; *Higher Education; Political Attitudes; *Teacher Education; University Administration

ABSTRACT

Higher education now faces problems which inhibit it from planning major new programs for the future. The two most serious problems are crises in funding aggravated by dwindling enrollments and lack of continuity in leadership. Teacher education programs are often spared from being cut--some have been expanded--because they are cheap to run, but interests of budget and cost efficiency preclude innovations. In terms of leadership, individual private interest, examplified by faculty collective bargaining, often ignores larger issues. College administrator turnover is rapid, partly because the jobs are so demanding and frustrating. This too diminishes long-term cooperative planning. A swing to conservatism in American politics has influenced education. People seem ready for a return to the 3 Rs; other aspects of traditional universities will survive as well, while the rest will rely mostly on field experiences and emphasize real skills as opposed to titles and credentials. Those seriously interested in progressive education should work together to prevent a chaotic, unplanned, and undesirable educational future. (CD)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED118533

Occasional Paper No. 11

FORCES AFFECTING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: IS ANYONE DRIVING?

by

Frederick Cyphert, Dean
College of Education
The Ohio State University

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The Center for Vocational Education
The Ohio State University

May 1975

SP009 811

PREFACE

The Center for Vocational Education welcomed Dean Frederick Cyphert, The Ohio State University, College of Education, who presented a paper to The Center and The Ohio State University staff on the topic of forces affecting program development in higher education. Dr. Cyphert's extensive experience in university administration qualifies him to examine in depth the progress of colleges and universities in their struggle to develop educational programs that meet society's continually changing needs and expectations.

Dr. Cyphert describes in his presentation several factors that are occurring in society and impinging on higher education. His observations concerning program development in higher education and suggestions for dealing with factors influencing program development, should be of definite interest to educators.

A native of Clarion, Pennsylvania, Dr. Cyphert earned his bachelor of science degree from Clarion State College in 1949. His advanced degrees include an M. A. from Syracuse University in 1950 and Ed.D. from the University of Pittsburgh in 1957.

He is widely known as a leader in the work of a number of professional organizations. His service has included the presidencies of the Virginia Association of Deans of Education, the Virginia Educational Research Association, the Association of Colleges and Schools of Education in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the Ohio Council on Teacher Education, and the Ohio College Association, Teacher Education section.

In addition, Dean Cyphert has been a director of the Ohio Association for Higher Education; member of the State Advisory Board on Teacher Education in both Ohio and Virginia; a director of the Virginia Center for the Study of Science, Technology and Public Policy; member of the Liaison Committee of the University of Virginia and the Federal Executive Institute; member of the Government Relations Committee of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and member of the Advisory Board of the National Center for the Development of Training Materials in Teacher Education.

Dean Cyphert has been chairman of the Commission on Curriculum and Instruction of the Ohio Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development; the Commission on National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards of the AACTE; and the Commission on the Teaching Profession of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

He was co-director of a National Institute of Health project on the preparation of educational specialists for the health professions. He has served as consultant to the Curriculum Council of the Columbus, Ohio, Public Schools; the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education; the U. S. Office of Education Research and Educational Personnel Development Branches; the

Graduate Education Study of the state of Georgia; and the Resource Allocation Study of the University of Missouri.

The author of numerous articles, he is also the co-author of several books including: *Teaching in America, Teaching in the American Secondary School, An Analysis and Projection of Research in Teacher Education, A Taxonomy of Teacher Classroom Behavior,* and *Academic Administration: The Deanship.*

On behalf of The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational Education, we take pleasure in sharing with you Dr. Frederick Cyphert's presentation, "Forces Affecting Program Development in Higher Education: Is Anyone Driving?"

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational Education

FORCES AFFECTING PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION: IS ANYONE DRIVING?

Ted Cyphert

I remember a cartoon that used to appear quite frequently as part of the comics which shows a bus hurrying down the road with heads and faces sticking out of all of the windows. It's obvious that there are far more people aboard the bus than there should be. The one voice that you see in the whole picture is somebody shouting, "Is anybody driving?" The answer is obvious: no one is driving. That's where I think we happen to be in higher education, consequently the title of this presentation.

One format for organizing issues in higher education is through the alternative futures model. In this model, the first task involves a status study of what exists now. Second, predictions are made of the most likely future, given existing causal conditions. Third, a more desirable future is predicted. This is perhaps where we would like to be, instead of where we are likely to be. Then, obviously, one of the things one thinks about is what kinds of interventions might we make in order to make the more desirable future and the most likely future the same. My remarks will concentrate on the line that links where we are today with where I think we are most likely to be. I am not talking about where we should be; but rather, where I think we are likely to be. I will concentrate on some selected factors that I think are happening, that impinge upon higher education, and that are likely to move us in certain directions unless we do something about those forces.

In the immediate past, higher education has had the luxury of growing enrollments, of reasonable adequate state, federal, and foundation funding, which has allowed us the ease of simply creating programs as these factors would allow us. Building new programs has not been a problem for higher education in the past ten to fifteen years. Obviously the current scene in higher education presents us with a different picture. There are now fewer enabling factors and many more constraining factors. Now more than ever we need a way of thinking about our role in the university and in the community which will give us some confidence to decide what to do and what not to do. We are forced to plan for these constraints in a way that will enhance the future state of higher education.

Obviously the threat of restricted funds and other factors may goad us into courses of action which would not serve well either higher education or the nation. In this regard I will discuss briefly some factors that are impinging upon us internally, that is, within a university; and externally, outside the university, which are creating a most likely future for us. Although I will probably lean heavily for illustration upon my own background in teacher education, I think it would not be difficult for any of us to give illustrations of the same phenomena in other areas of higher education.

One cannot look at higher education in the future without thinking about enrollments. The Ohio State University Center for Business and Economic Research notes that: "For many decades

Ohio kept pace in population growth with the United States as a whole. Beginning in the late 60's, however, Ohio's growth rate leveled off, and now, in the first years of the 70's, Ohio has experienced the third lowest rate of population increase and the highest rate of out-migration in all fifty states. The birth rate in Ohio has decreased an estimated 37.7 percent since 1960, reaching its lowest point since 1959. Given that there is a direct relationship between the number of births and the number of children entering the first grade, we can expect this enrollment to drop by more than one-third by 1984." As The Center projects, "unless the birth trends are reversed soon, . . . there will be less than three-fourths as many pupils attending our public elementary and secondary schools as are now enrolled." The implications for schools, colleges, the economy, and the education profession are certainly dramatic, particularly in relation to budget constraints which will be discussed later. In other words, we are going to have fewer students; and, as noted in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, there are large numbers of colleges and universities that exist today that just will not exist in ten years because there will not be the student population to make them viable institutions anymore. You know as well as I the embarrassment that superintendents are facing today when they close schools that a few years ago they were passing bond issues to build. In this country bigger and better go together; therefore, smaller means poorer. This mind set certainly has implications for higher education.

Juxtaposed with these enrollment projections is a phenomenon which is occurring in teacher education which may not be uncommon in other professions. While declining enrollment in teacher education has been a general phenomenon in good and bad institutions and in large and small institutions alike, some institutions, chiefly of a nonaccredited variety, (those that are usually dependent upon teacher education enrollments to maintain fiscal solvency because teacher education is the cheapest program they run) have taken this opportunity to fill the vacuum, as it were, by increasing their teacher education enrollment by as much as 50 to 100 percent in the past three years. This expansion of the "AVIS" or second class institutions (see Reisman and Jencks) coupled with the decline of productivity from the "Hertz" programs (Michigan State, Wisconsin, Minnesota, The Ohio State University, etc.) is surely not designed to increase the overall performance levels of entering teachers in this country. In chatting with the chairman of the sociology department in a "Big Ten" institution the other day, he said that they are cutting down on their doctoral program in sociology in view of the slackening demand on the national level. At the same time, two other institutions in that state that I would like to think are lesser institutions, particularly in sociology, have inaugurated for the first time Ph.D. programs in sociology. The "AVIS Phenomenon" is not limited to teacher education.

Closely associated with the enrollment question is the problem of declining budgets in higher education. As budgetary allocation formulae are related to enrollments and students credit hour generation, we can expect our budgets to decline as enrollments decline. Although this phenomenon is related to student-centered units of the university, it most certainly impacts on the amount of money that the university has available for spending in general, which means that it affects non-credit generating facets of the university as well. The implications are many, and most of them are obvious. In other words, far less activity will occur which does not produce student credit hours. This means that there are going to be fewer service activities and fewer research activities. What is done in the research and service arena is going to come from resources outside the state and/or the university. That is, service and research, if you will, is going to be for sale and if it is not salable it is not going to be done. This situation forces us to be able to show immediate demonstrable impact or product from our research activity. Obviously, this may cause us to question whether or not to continue to engage in basic research or in longitudinal studies.

In addition, we are all aware that any movement in new directions within the university requires what are called "developmental costs." We cannot do something new and different for quite the same costs as continuing to do the old. Once the activity becomes routinized, those costs disappear, but there are these developmental costs. What we have instead is a faculty that is not expanding, and is perhaps overworked with just what they are doing now. There are no resources available to pay for developmental costs and developmental time, and the result is an increasing disappearance of the experimental and the innovative. We simply do not have money to pay for innovation. If this condition continues to develop unrestrained, our activities will be chosen solely on the basis of cost efficiency, not necessarily on their ability to improve the effectiveness of programs.

A further strain on the university budget is the increasing pressure from constituent groups in all professional fields to become more practice-oriented in its preparation programs, which increases the drain on resources. Practicum activities are always more costly to execute and supervise than are didactic activities. Consequently those persons in charge of university programs are faced with the dilemma, given the shortage of resources, of ignoring this pressure for increased involvement in the field, or of succumbing to it and of necessity transferring much of their responsibility for programs to field practitioners. Neither choice, at least on the surface, is acceptable.

As we are all aware, faculties of many universities across the nation are now in the process of examining collective bargaining as a possible alternative for achieving professional and economic advances, and many faculties are in the preliminary stages of forming bargaining units. Three factors are being confirmed by this movement. One of these is that all of the data seems to show that the amount of money available to the institution as a whole does not vary, whether or not the institution has adopted collective bargaining. The institutions that have gone into collective bargaining do some things differently with their budget than they did before they had collective bargaining, but the amount of money that they get from the state is about the same. In other words, the collective bargaining process has just not altered the size of the university budget.

Second, the percent of the total university funds that go into faculty salaries increases significantly when there is a collective bargaining unit. For example, in the two year institutions in New York prior to collective bargaining about 66 percent of the budget was allocated for faculty salaries. At the end of three years of collective bargaining, 86 percent of the budget was allocated to faculty salaries. The proportionate decrease has come largely from instructional facilities, resources, and equipment. In essence, we have better paid teachers, and poorer accouterments of instruction.

Third, raises are less differentiated under collective bargaining and there is a much higher percentage of across-the-board raises. This practice gives less incentive for doing better. In this situation we are again faced with the dichotomy presented by Guba and Getzels of ideographic versus nomothetic goals. Ideographic, or individual goals, are going to take priority over nomothetic, or institutional goals when there is less incentive to do what the institution would have its faculty do. If the reward system is equalized, then there will be little reason to go beyond one's ideographic interests. These three related forces are bound to impact upon the quality of instruction and curriculum development in an institution.

Other issues that may evolve are those of program control and public reaction to bargaining institutions, but this is too new a phenomenon in our portion of higher education to generalize

much from it. To date, collective bargaining is much more widespread in certain kinds of institutions than in others. The major doctoral/research producing institutions have just not been unionized.

Another factor that is occurring and at an increasing rate, is what could be called changing leadership. The tenure for presidents, deans, department chairpersons, and directors is getting shorter and shorter. It is now less than four years for both presidents and deans. This rapid turnover in position is also true for superintendents and many others in leadership roles in other social institutions. Increased pressures, both internal and external, make their jobs less desirable and, in fact, less "doable." Administrators are vulnerable to being removed from making an unpopular decision, regardless of the substantive merit of the decision. Because of this quick turnover, there is a decrease in the continuity of leadership. No institution can execute long-range plans and projections with revolving leadership. This means that there is an increasing emphasis on what could be called the "quick and dirty," because it can at least be accomplished within one's tenure of office, as this contrasts with more lengthy planning and decision-making.

The problems of population decline and collective bargaining are not unrelated to many other kinds of constraints on the university. It is obvious that public sentiment toward the university has some relation to the amounts of money allocated by state legislatures and the congress to public education. This sentiment is formed by a public which asks, "Why does it continue to cost more to educate fewer students?" or which sees faculties embroiled in salary disputes or in such things as shortening calendars. The general populace, too, is suffering from the strains of inflation. Consequently the image-makers within the university would suggest that we respond to constituent pressures by making program decisions in an increasingly political fashion.

To explicate the increasing politicization of education, I must borrow from my own experience with teacher education. Leaders in teacher education are discovering the startling fact that many of us are making most of our professional decisions primarily on the basis of political considerations rather than on demonstrable fact. Consciously and unconsciously our decisions are becoming increasingly substance-free.

Whereas past decisions have been based on our knowledge of teacher education, and only their implementation has been political, now politics has begun to pervade the basic decision itself.

Another example of the way in which political considerations permeate decisions in our profession is seen in the current mass movement to substantially increase the field experience portion of preservice teacher education. In spite of the fact that there is no conclusive evidence regarding potential effectiveness or ineffectiveness of increased field experience, this politically inspired movement goes forward. It is a response to pressures exerted by a lay public attracted by a simplistic solution to the ills of teacher education, as well as the pressures generated by a majority of classroom teachers, whose motivation is primarily to gain control of teacher education rather than to improve it. In effect, teacher educators have not held foremost questions concerning the effect and the effectiveness of the increased field experience on the developing skills of a generation of prospective teachers. Neither are they structuring this program modification so that its impact will be measurable.

In short, as leaders in teacher education, we find ourselves participants in a profession of fragmented interest groups. We compete with each other to gain control over the total profession or

to preserve the turf we currently hold. We are, in essence, a confederation of territories, each protecting our domain to the exclusion of other forces in the profession. We seek political feasibility rather than knowledge desirability. We spend our energies fighting among ourselves rather than attacking the content questions which education must alleviate. The concept that "knowledge is power" is less true in the knowledge industry than in almost any other segment of society. Unless we can increase the substantive basis for our decision-making, we will continue to be forced to act more like politicians than educators.

Not unrelated to the phenomenon of over-politicization is what I view as the increasing swing of this country toward conservatism. The populace seems less willing to accept on faith new and innovative approaches to education. Whereas, we have progressed in service and in industry to a point of no return, we want to go back to the "good old days" in the arena of ideas—and in our approach to education. The Columbus Public Schools recently moved to establish an experimental-traditional school in which discipline and the three R's are going to be emphasized. This decision is generating much enthusiasm.

The same phenomenon is occurring in higher education; that is, institutions of a more conservative nature are prospering more than innovative institutions.

To paraphrase what the commencement speaker said a few weeks ago to our graduates: "If universities are leadership institutions in society, then they must lead." Universities today are either reactive and just respond to whichever way they are pushed, or they are nonreactive, that is no matter how they are pushed, they are not aware that society is asking them to change.

The above factors are familiar to all of us. I would like to add to this list a few items that I think the public will not demand but which I think we are going to have to learn. We are going to have to learn to work cooperatively with other professions, with other disciplines, and with other agencies in comprehensive attacks upon the ills of society. Universities have tended to be "loners." We have great difficulty in working with other universities; we have great difficulty in working with other departments; we have great difficulty in working with the professor across the hall; we are uncomfortable when collaborating with non-educational organizations. We tend to be the bastion, I suspect, of rugged individualism.

However, most of the social problems in this world that are worth solving are too complex to be solved by any one profession operating unilaterally. Somehow we have to learn how to join hands in attacking social problems. We are going to have to know what we have to contribute, what the other professions have to contribute, and to have enough language in common that we can join hands in some kind of a concerted attack. These needed relationships can have a tremendous impact on the kind of programs we generate.

Also, I think that we have become too enamored with the traditional audiences that we serve. For example, those of us in colleges of education have operated on the assumption, without ever making it explicit, that all learning takes place between the ages of six and sixteen, inside the four walls of the school. You and I know that never was true and it is perhaps less true today than it ever was. There is some evidence now that more of what you and I as adults know was learned outside of a formal institutional setting than was learned inside that formal institutional setting. Schooling will always be an important part of our work, but we have to be thinking of some new targets

as well because society is different. Colleges of education are not alone in this idea of expanding the kinds of targets that potentially can benefit from what portions of higher education have to contribute. While not neglecting the formal educational institution, all of us should give increasing attention to the learning needs of all ages and conditions of man.

Let me close with a prediction. I think that within the next few years higher education will divide itself into two camps. I think that one of these will look pretty much as universities look today, therefore I'm not going to describe that one. I think that the second camp will be so different that if a modern day Rip Van Winkle awoke after five years, he would not recognize it and certainly would not call it a university. I think these will be very externally oriented organisms. Programs will be field-based, practitioners will be heavily involved, and these programs will be politically responsive. Productivity will be measured in products developed and in student competencies learned, rather than in credit hours. One's job and one's education will be seen by those institutions as inseparable. Credentialism will play a much more minor role in these institutions than it does in ours. Degrees and titles will mean a lot less and the ability to deliver the goods in concrete terms is going to mean considerably more. I further predict that most of the institutions in group one, those of the classical universities, are going to disappear. I think that a few of us will remain, and those that remain will be the ones that are preeminent in doing what universities now do. These remaining institutions will probably move in the opposite direction of being more highly theoretical and more research oriented. Although they will survive, they may not be well appreciated. I do not know if this change will be good, but I do believe that those of us who care have to get very busy in listening to what the broader society is saying and, more than just listening, in attempting to influence it, to becoming a part of it, and to being the knowledgeable people that we are. If we do not, somebody else is going to make our decisions for us.

Obviously, my conscience dictates that I conclude with the admission that my crystal ball is not particularly clear. I am aware that "Forecasting is a very difficult business, especially when it has to deal with the future!"